

System Transformation Initiative

Embassy Suites, Tukwila, Washington
November 15, 2006

EVALUATION FORM

THE PURPOSE OF THE FORUM TODAY WAS:

- ✓ To involve and inform a broad network of stakeholders
- ✓ To brainstorm ideas and strategies for Task Force/Consultant consideration

CIRCLE THE RATING THAT BEST DESCRIBES HOW WELL WE ACCOMPLISHED OUR PURPOSE:

Very Poor 1 2 3 X 4 Very Well

Participants were asked to rate the Community Forum on a scale of 1 to 4, with 4 the highest rating. The mean average for the Forum was 3.47.

# Respondents	Score	%
38	4.0	54 %
6	3.5	8 %
19	3.0	28 %
1	2.75	1 %
3	2.5	4 %
3	2.0	4 %
1	No Rating	1 %
71		100%

COMMENTS:

(4.0)

- Outstanding leaders and excellent brain storming.
- It was helpful to have explanations of terms and acronyms.
- Thank you!
- I hope you share all the comments of the participants.
- Facilitator assistance was great.
- Well thought out process.
- Great location, food and presentations.
- Well done. The table discussions were productive, enlightening and helped the overall purpose of this forum.
- Fairly wide range of ideas represented.
- Very informative.
- Great input from everyone at our table. Everyone was made to feel comfortable to give input.
- Nice facility.
- The opportunity to Brainstorm” with individuals, both professions/professions self identified consumers across the state was incredible. The sharing of ideas and the option to submit individual ideas was empowering!
- Very engaging—thanks for being candid; using plain talk; and listening to the voice of the consumer—which is why we are here.
- Great group discussion at my table. Good networking opportunities. I really appreciated the effort to keep the meeting on time. Great lunch—one of the best at a conference.
- Workgroups at tables was informative. Keeping on task and to time tables was good.
- Great job staying on schedule. I had a great table leader.
- Good cross section of participants, nice packets, and great lunch!
- Great staff organization!
- Phenomenal conference!! Very worthwhile and rewarding!
- It is very effective to have a wide variety of stakeholders address these vital issues together.
- Excellent representation of all stakeholders.
- Almost all of the material was already known for scores of years by about 50% of attendees.
- Presentations of table discussions were less helpful because the table discussions themselves were very dynamic and productive.
- S.T.I. language and definitions: “recovery & resiliency”, definition of consumer to include parents and youth.
- Good flow, good timing, good pace.
- Excellent forum.
- We had great discussions.
- Enjoyed the day.
- I felt it was very informative and helpful, statewide.
- A lot in a short time—bet we made it work!

(3.5)

- Excellent setting, refreshments, agenda (varied)
- Good input from a variety of community sources.

- Less emphasis on adult populations. Should include children, youth and families in the plan. Early intervention would mean less other people receive services too late or not at all.
- Great information, good presentation. Disappointed there wasn't more with regard to children, youth, and families.
- Good place, good use of time framing these issues before small group.
- Well structured, kept the side talk to a minimum or it would have gone on forever.

(3.0)

- Want to see action from input.
- It was informative.
- Viewpoints and perspective of consumers and alternate care providers.
- Thank you!
- Need more information as a parent of a consumer not knowledgeable about PACT.
- Overall a good exercise.
- Very good first step.
- Excellent background and program information provided.
- I learned a lot. I primarily came for PACT, but I learned a lot. I really appreciated getting to know people at my table.
- Too pressed for time.
- Nice clear presenters.
- Funneling of ideas and attitudes could have been more effective. Presentation of outcomes rushed.
- Generally it was a nice way to generate discussion and feedback.
- For a meeting with 150 people, this went well.
- The day was well organized and nicely presented.
- Facilitators were helpful.

(2.75 – no rating)

- Thanks for the opportunity to express our concerns. Please embrace improvement and change.
- We really need a fiscal and services model which dovetails to provide less services with greater efficiency.
- You asked us to discuss something but already had a plan that felt like you already have all the problems solved—we got duped.
- Take the ideas and write them up for an e-mail distribution.
- Being told at the start that feedback may not be incorporated into discussion was a rough way to start!
- Not really clear how feedback will be integrated, e.g., housing discussion. Is there truly an intended plan or merely a discussion?
- Very well organized and well represented.
- Food was great.

WHAT WAS HELPFUL, WHAT WORKED?

(4.0)

- Good information, particularly about Transformation.
- Having a facilitator at the tables to keep the group on track and to record.

- The focus of attention to specific topics; getting some history to refresh my memory.
- Table discussions were very good. Sharing of information was great.
- How the three areas were planned out.
- Discussion on PACT and feedback from the audience.
- Opportunity to mingle with other agencies.
- Table talk.
- Good interaction with others and good information.
- Table discussions and printed material of the PowerPoint slides.
- Small group discussions.
- Opportunity to be updated on MHD's perspective; round table discussions were well facilitated.
- Breaking down areas of discussion to specific areas and questions.
- Table discussions brainstorming worked well.
- Slides review with background information on each topic for Forum attendees along with identical hand-out to follow as we moved through the day. I could listen to the report and then re-read the handout for clarity.
- Large group overview leads into small group discussion, then report out. It was a smooth process. Having a facilitator at each table –invaluable!
- The location and coffee and great menu!
- Having 3 distinct topics for discussion.
- Group discussion is very helpful.
- Discussion with others.
- Group discussions.
- The questions were thought provoking.
- Great opportunity for our input gave us hope for things getting better!
- Hearing from other tables.
- Table discussions.
- Table discussions—rapid and smart conversations.
- Tables with facilitator presentations. No long, boring power point presentations!
- Limiting tables to 8 people. A good blend of professionals, consumers, families, etc.
- Table discussions were great!
- Focusing on a short list of important topics!
- Timed, focused discussions at table.
- Handouts and structure.
- I loved being with a variety of people with diverse backgrounds for solutions.
- Less formal presentation other than on the subject matter.
- Well done—good food!
- Small table discussions and input. Good format for data collection. Well planned and executed.
- Discussions on the different topics: PACT, Medicaid, Housing. The report outs from each table had excellent recommendations.
- Group exercises.
- The group input was helpful. I really appreciated and used this time to collaborate.
- Formal instructions, etc.

(3.5)

- Good individual table discussions.
- Good idea to have facilitator at each table.

- Lots of input from multiple systems.
- Being able to participate in conversation and input.
- Open discussion.
- We had copies of materials.
-

(3.0)

- Overview helpful, group work was structured.
- The small groups.
- Break out sessions and then report back.
- Able to learn more about different programs and process.
- Table discussion, good facilitator, was able to distill our comments.
- Group discussion.
- Good discussion in our group.
- Working with other people to find support answers.
- Table discussions.
- Table discussions-gave voice to every person attending and helped with better understanding of topics.
- Good balance of work sessions and breaks.
- Housing presentation.
- Liked small table discussion of issues.
- Hearing from people who did the work and people who were consumers.
- Small groups effective.
- Sharing with others and the small groups.

(2.75 – no rating)

- The team approach. Next time do not ask table captains to come up. Bring the microphone to them.
- We clarified what we wanted.
- Group discussion was the best part.
- Table talk.
- Good facilitation.
- Information about the initiatives was very useful.
- Provision of information.
- Information was great, talking in groups, and sharing thoughts with one another.

WHAT WOULD YOU HAVE DONE DIFFERENTLY?

(4.0)

- Tables should have read something-small paper about PACT before coming. They didn't seem to see the impact of the program.
- Too much time discussing numbers and placement of number of teams—obvious from the slides.
- Changing speakers to describe programs—new voices help.
- Can't think of any.
- None.
- Put speaker in the middle of the room rather than the end and monitor volume of speakers. Make handouts large enough to read.

- Nothing.
- Eat less. Great food! Thanks.
- Would have liked the questions ahead of time so I could have gathered my colleague's ideas as well.
- Moved people: go from breakfast/opening table to sitting with others after lunch, followed by late afternoon tables with another set of forum members.
- Tina's history of deinstitutionalization was unnecessary—too much blah, blah, blah; could start with the housing readiness story.
- If appropriate, a list of attendees (or) a way to follow up network contacts.
- Although it was a large group, I would have liked to see everyone introduce themselves.
- More time for discussions and questions.
- Nothing.
- Maybe arranged tables by stakeholder so that all perspectives were heard (If you have just one provider at table of consumers that person might not feel comfortable speaking up.)
- Reports from tables were tedious. Encourage crisp summaries instead.
- Limit tables to six people next time so we can each talk more.
- Invited representatives from the business community—particularly when so much emphasis on vocational and work involvement.
- Acknowledge that these problems are not new and acknowledge that they have been addressed many, many times before.
- Do not use the Best Western for hotel for consumers.
- Acronyms alert first thing: acronyms list.
- More healthy snacks.
- Nothing really, but we should get an assessment of how many consumers were in attendance.

(3.5)

- Tried to tackle too much at one time. Would have shortened the agenda to discuss significant issues where the rubber meets the road.
- More time, felt rushed.
- Mixed tables up after people settle in. Too many people sitting with like-minded people.
- One or more consumers at each table.
- Separated folks from the same agencies.

(3.0)

- Done a two day workshop or gone longer.
- More information and more handouts.
- More succinct background discussion and presentations.
- More consolidation of tables, based on lower attendance than anticipated. This would facilitate discussion and reporting.
- Language.
- More time for table discussions.
- 20 minutes allocated after each topic for discussion with the audience.
- Have more table facilitators identify themselves. Offer shuttle/combined rides from various counties.
- Little more networking.

- I would have had lots more consumers here! Consumer input is the key to a consumer driven system.
- More on barriers, specifically addressing co-occurring disorders and lack of services.
- No need to report out as feedback was recorded and submitted. Would have saved time.
- Put in place a plan to actually incorporate feedback information, instead of saying “maybe we’ll use it or maybe we won’t”. There was no discussion as to limitations of implementing feedback ideas. People feel forum could just be giving people false hope.
- More limited agenda—hard to maintain focus for 6 hours.
- Some way to identify who is in audience, i.e., providers, state, consumer, parent, etc.

(2.75 – no rating)

- Housing should BE FIRST! NOT LAST. It is an element #1 for Recovery.
- Actuarial studies preceded by consumer-made analysis.
- The PowerPoint presented was weak because of all the acronyms and lingo. Who’s “Tri” whatever?
- Make this a longer meeting.
- More focus on children. Less instructions/powerpoint and more work time.
- Report back wasn’t helpful or useful.
- Wish we had spent more time receiving information and being able to ask questions.
- More clear intention for outcome of the day. Majority of comments from groups was that which could be anticipated. So, was there some concrete presentation or work that might have been done?

OTHER COMMENTS?

(4.0)

- Food was good. It was nice to have free and convenient parking.
- Thanks for listening!
- Thanks for the opportunity to meet with others. It amazes me how consistent the themes are regardless of “special interests”.
- What is the date and location of the next meeting?
- Great job to Andy, Maria, Gaye and Richard!
- Looking forward to the next one.
- Excellent! Thank you.
- I am so glad I came! I thought I would simply come, write notes, and leave. The discussions broadened my knowledge base! Thank you!
- More consumers.
- Have more of these meetings.
- I would hope the State takes written comments and suggestions seriously.
- I am honored by this opportunity to serve in this transition process of information gathering to transform the MH system in WA. KUDOS to all who stand up to be counted and have their voice/agency/consumer issues and suggestions for resolutions heard. Thank you.
- Will PowerPoint be posted on a web site?
- Andy—thank you for keeping the process moving and getting us out on time.
- Thank you for implementing what it takes to fulfill our expressed needs.

- Loved the pretzels—it was nice to have a salty snack in addition to the sweets.
- Excellent forum. This should help to shape implementation strategies for the TGMHP.
- Lunch—fantastic!
- Please distribute the synthesis of the day's work, especially the identified priorities.
- Youth on Task Force? According to TWG, groups should have 2 of each: adult consumers, adult family members, youth consumers, and youth family member.
- Well done!
- Thanks.
- Thanks for having me facilitate! It was fun and I didn't end up having to talk!

(3.5)

- It would be good if some of the same folks are involved as these meetings progress to seed future groups with what works has already been done.
- Nice job.

(3.0)

- Good variety of food, allowed me to maintain my diet without asking for special accommodations.
- Offer a summary to people after the session.
- Have in Olympia, rather than in Seattle.

(2.75 – no rating)

- Good food.
- Thank you!
- The intent of PACT needs to be more transparent to those who will be using it.
- The purpose seemed to be merely to crease a sense of stakeholder buy-in, but still not sure to what plan or intent?
- Had a very, very nice time. Feel I can go out into community with more confidence in what I learned.